DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 246 463 CS 208 496

AUTHOR Robinson, Gertrude J.
TITLE Mass Communication in Ferment: Open Questions in the Historiography of the Field.
PUB DATE Aug 84
NOTE 38p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (67th, Gainesville, FL, August 5-8, 1984).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Broadcast Industry; *Communication Research; *Communications; *Historiography; Intellectual History; Mass Media; Philosophy; Propaganda; *Research Methodology; Social History; Technological Advancement; Theories

ABSTRACT

Thomas S. Kuhn's paradigm theory, which explains the growth of science, can be used to challenge three aspects of the received history of North American communications research: (1) the beginning point of the field and its periodization, (2) the development of mass media studies as an articulated subfield, and (3) the role of new technologies in paradigm change. Historical evidence indicates that the philosophy of progressivism, which links new broadcast technology with social progress and the emergence of social psychology and sociology at the turn of the century, provides an empirical parentage for communication studies in the United States. The first institutionalization of the emerging discipline must therefore be sought at the Chicago school, not with P. F. Lazarsfeld. The Bureau of Social Research constitutes a second developmental change that articulates a paradigm for a new subfield--media studies. This paradigm was heavily influenced by governmental propaganda preoccupations during World War II, in which institute members were involved. Alternative, symbolic interactionist, and Marxist inspired paradigm groups were not able to challenge the Lazarsfeld limited-effects formula until the 1970s when the interactive technology debate provided an opening for a renewed assessment of communications assumptions. (Author/CRH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Qualitative Studies Division

ED246463

MASS COMMUNICATION IN FERMENT:

OPEN QUESTIONS IN THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE FIELD

by Gertrude J. Robinson

Graduate Program in Communication
McGill University
Montréal, Quebec

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gertrude J. Robinson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Presented to the Qualitative Studies Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication Annual Convention, Gainesville, Florida, August 5-8, 1984.

MASS COMMUNICATION IN FERMENT: OPEN QUESTIONS IN THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE FIELD

Gertrude J. Robinson
Professor
Graduate Program in Communications
McGill University
Montreal, Quebec

ABSTRACT

This paper uses Kuhn's paradigm theory which explains the growth of science, to challenge three aspects of the received history of North American communications research. These are the beginning point of the field and its periodization; the development of mass media studies as an articulated sub-field; and the role of new technologies in paradigm change. Historical evidence indicates that the philosophy of Progressivism which links new broadcast technology with social progress and the emergence of social psychology and sociology at the turn of the century provide an 'empirical' parentage for communication studies in the United States. The first institutionalization of our emerging discipline must therefore be sought at the Chicago School, not with Lazarsfeld. The Bureau of Social Research constitutes a second developmental change which articulates a paradigm for a new sub-field: e.g. media studies. This paradigm, it turns out is heavily influences by governmental propoganda preoccupations during World War II, in which Institute members are involved. Alternative, symbolic interactionist, and Marxist inspired paradigm grouos aee not able to challenge the Lazarsfeld limited effects formula till the seventies when the interactive technology debate provides an opening for a renewed assessment of communications assumptions.

Presented to the Qualitative Studies Division at the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication Annual Convention in Gainesville, Florida, August 5-8, 1984.

INTRODUCTION

One of the things that is difficult to remember is that in the United States the growth of film and broadcasting and the development of mass communication research were virtually co-terminous. This contrasts sharply with the continental European situation, where historical studies of the press and the social role of newspapers were investigated as early as the mid-nineteenth century by Schäffle, Knies and Bücher. (Hardt, 1978:41-124) Both traditions however have one thing in common. they link the rise of the mass media with the infancy of our discipline. In his interesting new book, The Politics of TV Violence, Willard Rowland (1983) is one of the first scholars to ask himself whether this association had some consequences for the ways in which mass communication grew up as a field of study in North America. He points out that in contrast to Europe, communications inquiries started in an era in which pragmatism and the Progressive movement held sway, both of which translated social issues into media issues and attributed messianic competencies to the social sciences for resolving these issues. (Rowland, 1983:22)

The argument goes something like this: First, that a confluence of industrial, social and political forces, as well as the needs of the growing discipline encouraged the framing of social change questions as mass media questions. Second, that the preferred solution to these questions is offered in "scientific" terms, broadly defined as "empirical method." Rowland notes:

> After World War I, with the rapid spread of film and radio, the economic and social impact of mass communication became a more serious public issue. Building on earlier important changes in popular culture, these more universally visible, national, economically significant media, became closely associated in the public mind with cultural and political dislocations (resulting from the industrial revolution) that defied easy analysis or acceptance. The growing complexities and ambiguities of modern life and the role in them of new communications technologies and cultural forms cried out for explanation. (Rowland, 1983:22)

These explanations sought were to be offered in "scientific" terms, a concept which had undergone substantial change in the past century. Schudson demonstrates how the definition of science and the scientific enterprise changed from a "codifying" to a "searching and testing" enterprise between 1840 and 1900. During this period the search for general historical, economic and political laws shifted from the theological/metaphysical to the "natural" realm which was interpreted as "overt" and "demonstrable." In its first flowering this naive empiricism focused attention on the gathering of seemingly neutral facts to explain societal conditions. (Schudson, 1978:) In the spirit of the times, the emerging disciplines of sociology and psychology also adopted "social science" methods to legitimate their novel enterprises. These methods had gained credence by being linked to the Department of Agriculture in 1862 and the official control institutions monitoring industrial monopolies during the Progressive period up to 1900. For the first time social scientists and the forms and values informing their ideas became absorbed and in turn adapted to the political process by helping to set government

policy towards business. Rowland explains that out of the struggles--and accommodations--among government, business, and reformers, social science emerged as an acceptable, seemingly "neutral", medium of resolution. (Rowland, 1983:40)

What Rowland is offering here is a Kuhnian approach to the understanding of the origins of communication studies in North America. This approach investigates science as a special kind of "community based" activity which is carried out in a particular place and time. To unravel the development of the sciences, Thomas Kuhn claims, one must first unravel the changing "community structure" of the sciences over time." (Kuhn, 1970:180)

In this paper I will argue two things. First, that in North America the emergence of new communications technologies have always been viewed as challenges to the existing social order. They have consequently engendered conflicting reactions and heated debates about their social implications. They have also always included both poles of evaluation: the messianic and the demonic. In the case of television, the most recent and spectacular pieces of communications technology, this debate has portrayed the new medium both as a repository of hope and of fear. Technocrats and liberals believe television offered hope for a revived democratic process, a stronger set of social bonds, a richer cultural life, and a vastly improved educational system. For more conservative institutions and publics, religious and educational, it was seen as the latest technological inroad into the family, interpersonal

relations and traditional cultural values. (Rowland, 1983:22-29) The same polarized arguments are now being heard concerning the social promise or social disaster flowing from the new cable and interactive technologies.

The second point I wish to make is that the debates about new technologies in the seventies have opened the way to new ways of looking at the media and thus to what may be called a "paradigm challenge." Since the doing of science is an ongoing historical process, technological debates, because they are implicitly about values, provide an opening for challenges to an established paradigm in a field. In this case the debates about new telecommunications technologies have provided an opening for "insurgent" methodologies which reconceptualize many of the research questions preoccupying North American communication studies in the eighties.

I. The Chicago School and the Pre-Paradigm Period of Communication Studies

Thomas Kuhn stresses that the historical emergence of science constitutes the emergence of a new way of thinking, different from the common sense modes of everyday life. Its growth develops through a series of breaks. During periods of paradigm growth (normal science) scientists attempt to extend established concepts and achievements to different areas of research, to force nature into the pre-formed and relatively inflexible box that the paradigm supplies. (Kuhn, 1970:24) This action provides direction

and orientation to scientific research, shaping expectations and assumptions about perceivedly physical phenomena. Yet, not all encountered data will be able to be placed within the pre-formed box. These discordant data or anomalies therefore accumulate over time and ultimately lead to radical conceptual overhauls (revolutions), as scientists in a particular area of research can no longer interpret and relate terms in their conceptual schemes. A new paradigm is then developed and "normal science" sets in until the cycle is repeated. Kuhn therefore believes that a discipline, grows through three stages. The first is the pre-paradigm period, when a number of schools compete for the domination of a given field. Second, the "normal science" period, when one paradigm dominates; and three, the revolutionary period, when paradigm change occurs and a new disciplinary world view is adopted. (Kuhn, 1970)

Using Kuhn's paradigm framework three aspects of the received history of North American communications research will be investigated: the beginning point of the field and its periodization; the development of mass media studies as an articulated sub-field and its predominant paradigm; and the role of new technologies in paradigm challenges.

Most received histories of North American communication, as presented in introductory textbooks, place the research activities of the past eighty years into only the most perfunctory social, political and academic context. As a consequence, the periodization proposed is extremely vague and ad hoc, loosely tied to the

emergence of new theories. Three stages of about twenty years each are usually isolated: the period after World War I through the 30's when instinct theory and the notion of the all-powerful media held sway. This is followed by the Lazarsfeld period of the 1940's and 1950's, when the discovery of intervening psychological and social variables lead to two more sophisticated theories: "individual differences" and "social categories" which lead to the opinion leadership and two-step flow models. (de Fleur and Ball-Rokeach, 1966, 1970, 1975) Finally, there is the most recent era which starts about 1960 with Joseph Klapper's middle range ideas about influence. Four directions can be distinguished here. Among them are those that use diffusion models from rural sociology to trace media innovation and information dissemination. Another direction, responding to the failure of causal models uses systems, gestalt and other holistic models to explain the uses and gratifications audiences receive. A third set of explanations of how preferences and reactions are shaped, are based on "agenda-setting" and the coordination uses of communication media. And parallel to these we find increased emphasis on "information processing" growing out of the cognitive development perspectives of psychology.

Clearly this sketch is over-simplified, yet it indicates that no thought has been given to the question of how one would go about writing a more adequate history of the field. Kuhn suggests in his Structure of Scientific Revolutions, that such a history would have to include not only the research act, but the intel-

lectual climate out of which the research grows. (Brown, 1970) He argues that this thinking occurs in a community setting consisting of the practitioners of a scientific specialty. (Kuhn, 1970: 176/7) New disciplines such a theory argues, do not appear full blown. They go through what Kuhn calls "pre-paradigm" states, when different groups of scholars vie with each other for ascendancy. Can we find such struggle and such groups in communication studies, and where would we look for them? Kuhn suggests that they are located in university and institute settings, yet departmental boundaries at the turn of the century were differently drawn, and communication studies had not yet been institutionalized. Lewis and Smith (1981) therefore propose, that a kind of anthropological "family tree" be created, including all those researchers who concern themselves with communication issues at different periods of time. In addition we need to know their friendship circles, and the young researchers they trained. Finally, it is important to investigate where these second generation scholars went and how they carried out their work. Utilizing these much more couple, sets of criteria, enables one to raise more specific questions about communication practitioners, their institutional setting, their relationship to applied research and government funding and their academic networks.

While most traditional histories perpetuate the "four fathers myth," Rowland points out that communication studies had their parentage in the twin disciplines of sociology and social psychology, which were first institutionalized at the University of

Chicago in 1900 and at the University of Pennsylvania in 1889. (Rowland, 1983:22) This means that the Chicago School where such people as George Herbert Mead, John Dewey, Florian Znanjetzki, Anthony Burgess and Robert E. Park worked during the twenties, and where Harold Lasswell received his Ph.D., must be considered as one of the founding centers for North American communication studies. Here Mead developed what his student Herbert Blumer later called "symbolic interactionism", while Park, Burgess and Znanjetzki used communication to describe the processes of social cohesion and social change. Communication processes, Park noted, take a different form in urban society. They change from gossip to organized information presentation through the press. He consequently devoted much thought to tracing the natural history of the newspaper (Park, 1928, 1952) and the role of the press in the integration of immigrants. (Park, 1922) He also investigated the kind of knowledge conveyed by newspapers and their role in public opinion formation, issues which occupied Walter Lippmann at approximately the same time. (Park 1925, 1952)

The pre-eminence of the Chicago school during this period is further attested by the fact that its professors edited the only journal in the field and held the presidency of the American Sociological Association until 1936. (Matthews, 1977) Members of their staff were also involved in the collective analysis of film violence and its effect on children, for which Blumer and Thurstone prepared studies. (Payne Fund Study 1928-33) While

the Chicago School attracted excellent students, Helen and Howard Hughes were among them, key professors like Mead and Park had not published widely by the beginning thirties. Matthews suggests that this fact and the rise of a more statistically rigorous approach to social issues practiced at other schools like Columbia and Harvard, explains the lack of sustained influence of symbolic interactionism on the discipline of sociology and thus on communication studies in the next decade. (Matthews, 1977) A similar conclusion is arrived at by Rowland who describes the closing of the Chicago era as follows:

> During the years immediately following World War I, a period in which American social, cultural, and economic affairs were marked by a series of rapid, often contradictory changes, the modern American, liberal social sciences began to assert themselves and to take shape. Behavioral theory finally displaced introspective psychology, and formal systemic American social psychology and sociology began to emerge, shifting attention away from the more characteristically European study of ideas, and meaning in society, toward the more organizational American concern with laws, mechanisms, and models. Public opinion polling became an integral part of the political process, decisions within national consumer industries came to rest increasingly on marketing research methods, and in support of all these "sciences" ever more value came to be ascribed to experimental and statistical methods. (Rowland, 1983:92)

This chronology suggests not only that Chicago must be viewed as the North American beginning point of communication studies, but also that this period can be distinguished from the approaches taken and work done by another group of people, who appear on the scene in the mid-thirties.

II. The Bureau of Applied Social Research: Foundation for the "Normal Science" Period in Mass Media Studies

Though much detailed work still needs to be done to determine whether communication studies in fact moved from the pre-paradigm to the paradigm stage at the end of the Chicago period, it is historically correct to note that the changed social science climate supports the work of a new group of people who center their work not on social processes but on the mass media. Four of these are usually associated with the founding of media studies. They are Paul Lazarsfeld, Harold Lasswell, Carl Hoveland, and Kurt Lewin. In deciding whether their claim to parentage is correct or not, Kuhn suggests we investigate whether they are guided by the same paradigm. The members of all scientific communities, including schools of the pre-paradigm period, he notes, share the sorts of elements which I have collectively labeled a "paradigm". And further: "A paradigm governs in the first instance not a subject matter, but rather a group of practitioners." (Kuhn, 1970:180) In the second edition of his Structure of Scientific Revolutions, Kuhn explains that a paradigm is a constellation of group commitments, more like a disciplinary matrix. This consists of four components: symbolic generalizations, shared commitments to certain fundamental beliefs (metaphysical), values concerning predictions and exemplars which are concrete problem solutions. (Kuhn, 1980:184-87)

The differences in training received, the variety of areas in which they worked and the dispersed geographical location of their

institutes makes it pretty unlikely that Lasswell, Hoveland, Lewin and Lazarsfeld can be viewed as a cohesive group of communication progenitors. What is more probably true is that their research findings helped to "make sense" out of the limited effects paradigm of the media which emerged at the end of this era and their names were for this reason associated with Lazarsfeld's. While detailed evidence for this claim still needs to be collected, the broad outlines for such a conclusion emerge from three factors. They are: the interconnection of progressivism and the growth of social science prestige in the thirties; the behavioristic approach to research taken by the four men; and the key brokerage role of Lazarsfeld and his Bureau in pulling together and popularizing these interconnections in the influential communication textbooks of the time.

According to Richard Hofstadter, the progressive movement of the twenties held out hope for the amelioration of individual and group life in modern America within the framework of constitutional law and a privately controlled economic structure. Modern man was perceived as rational and as an essentially perfectible human being possessed of analytic capability, who sought the information necessary to deal with the complexities of life. (Hofstadter, 1954:7) To appeal to this individual, Rowland argues, progressivists seized on education, communications and technology as primary instruments of reform all of which were to be mediated through "fact" gathering. Social science research and optimistic analysis of education and communications technology potentials were thus

implicitly joined well before any specific field of communications effects research emerged. (Rowland, 1983:45) Conjoined with this was the social and behavioral sciences legitimation by government and media needs; both seeking information on how to control production and consumption cycles during the depression and how to improve research techniques in a time of national market expansion.

The commitment to a social scientific outlook and behaviorist approaches to research are not difficult to document in the biographies of the four "founders", though each had his own quite unique interpretation of these concepts. Harold D. Lasswell (1902-1978) born in the Mid West and educated at the University of Chicago, (where he also taught from 1924-1938) is the person who most clearly provides a bridge between the first and the second periods. He was influenced by the pragmatic philosophy of Mead and Dewey as well as the logical positivism of Rudolph Carnap and Alfred Tarski. Daniel Lerner notes however that these influences were never direct borrowings but led to transformations and the development of a unique systematics, which Lasswell called "configuration analysis." Central to this analytic system was the clarification of values as a motivating force in human life. These values however were defined as "objects of desire - what people want" clearly a behavioristic definition.

Like Park, whom he knew as a colleague, he was interested in the formation of public opinion. Yet, Lasswell scrutinized it not as a social process, but by looking for "functional equivalences",

which could be discovered through content analysis and the pinpointing of key symbols. His dissertation "Propaganda Technique in the World War" (1927) laid the foundation for his interest in the role of communication in politics, which was further developed during World War II when, as director of a wartime project at the Library of Congress, he produced the studies published as Language of Politics (1949) His famous research formula, who says what to whom with what effect, also stems from this time, when it was proposed in a seminar as a schema for the analysis of Lazarsfeld's Radio Project data. (Morrison, 1978) After the war at Yale (1945-75) he turned from communications to the analysis of the policy sciences, through which he sought to integrate all of the behavioral sciences. (Lerner, 1979:405-408)

Empiricism and behaviorism take on quite a different shape in the work of Hoveland and Lewin, whose research results in cognitive progresses and group dynamics are directly used to argue what de Fleur and Ball-Rokeach call the psychodynamic and the sociocultural models of persuasion. (de Fleur and Ball-Rokeach, 1975:238-247) Both of these underlie Joseph Klapper's "limited" media effects theory. Charles I. Hoveland, also born in the Mid West (1912-1961) started his journalism studies at Northwestern where he received an MA in 1932 and then went to Yale for psychology training and a Ph.D. in 1936. Here he taught and did his famous persuasion experiments developed out of his wartime work in the Office of War Information where the American Soldier studies were mounted under Samuel Stouffer. (1942-45) Four books contain

his legacy before his untimely death in 1961. They are: Experiments on Mass Communication (1949); Communication and Persuasion (1954); Order of Presentation in Persuasion (1957); and Attitude Organization and Change (1960). This work, which systematically analyzed message and presenter charateristics as well as attitude formation, demonstrates that there is no direct relationship between information input and attitude change.

Kurt Lewin (1890-1947), another experimental psychologist, also produced evidence of intervening variables, this time of a "social nature" to strengthen the limited effects model. After a doctorate in Berlin, Lewin came to the United States in 1932, where he established himself at Cornell (1933-35) and then moved to the State University of Iowa (1935-44) as professor of child psychology. The social crisis turned his interest to problems of values, leadership and group life which ultimately led to the founding of the Research Center in Group Dynamics at MIT in 1944. The original senior staff consisted of Dorwin Cartwright, Leon Festinger; Ronald Lippitt; Marian Radke and John French.

Like so many other social scientists Lewin also worked for the government during wartime, contributing ideas to what is now called the field of social management. His book Resolving Social Conflicts (1947) shows that group membership can make a person resistant to change as well as contribute to opinion adaptation. As in Hoveland's work, the emphasis is however on the individual, ignoring the interrelationship between class and power. Laboratory and field experiments in factories and business indicate

Lewin's commitment to a methodology modeled on the natural sciences and foresees the conversion of basic knowledge into practice. (Cartwright, 1958:3-16)

The final argument against the "four father" myth, is Lazarsfeld's stellar role in creating the Bureau of Applied Social Research which popularized the contributions of Lasswell, Hoveland and Lewin. Bernard Berelson is one of the first to note it is Lazarsfeld rather than the group of four who is the key figure in giving direction to North American mass media studies in this, its second period of existence. Berelson proclaims in 1959; "in my view, Lazarsfeld was the only one of the four who centered on mass communications problems per se. Lasswell was interested in political power; Lewin in group functioning and Hoveland in cognitive processes. They utilized this field as a convenient entry to those broader concerns." (Berelson, 1959:15)

How and why did Lazarsfeld, the immigrant from Vienna who arrived in the United States in 1933 at the height of the Depression, assume this leadership position? His own "Memoir" and his major biographers provide a number of clues to explain his success. They suggest that Lazarsfeld brought with him an institute idea through which university know-how could both be taught and sold to clients, at a time when government and the media were thirsting for audience information. As an organizer of such an institute, it was furthermore in Lazarsfeld's interest to "promote" and to "name" a recognizable sub-speciality and an area of competence with which his institute would be identified. All of

this Lazarsfeld accomplished in the short period of ten years between 1936 and 1946.

It all began in 1933-34 when Lazarsfeld as a Rockefellar scholar visited the small number of universities where social research was being done. Among them was: Columbia, Harvard, Pittsburgh, Ohio State, Rochester and of course, the University of Chicago. In most of these places he tried to learn by attaching himself to one of the ongoing projects, making contacts as he went. (Sills, 1970:413) By 1936 his driving methodological enthusiasm and these contacts plus the good offices of Robert Lynd of Columbia, provided him with his first quasi-academic appointment at the University of Newark. This became the kernel out of which the Bureau of Applied Social Research ultimately grew. The "Memoir" notes that he sought to create the institute for both professional security and out of a "European attitude." (Memoir 11:3) This referred to the German academic's expectation, that a professor of distinction needed an institution to stand for himself and his work. (Morrison, 1978:350)

Like the Vienna institution on which it was modeled, the Newark center was only loosely associated with the Department of Psychology, where Lazarsfeld as director taught two courses. Contract research paid for most of the other expenses. The initial task was to analyze 10,000 questionnaires of unemployed New Jersians, but this emphasis soon shifted, when Lazarsfeld was made acting director of the Princeton Office of Radio Research in 1937. His co-directors were Fred Stanton of CBS and Hadley Cantril and

the funding came from the Rockefeller Foundation. After two years with research contacts increasingly centered in New York City, the office was moved to the Columbia campus. Here Lazarsfeld became a tenured faculty member in the Department of Sociology and here in 1945 the Office of Radio Research metamorphosed into the Bureau of Applied Social Research, which it had always been in Lazarsfeld's mind.

In the two years between 1937 and 1939 the project was to develop methods for analyzing the role of radio in the lives of different types of people and to determine the different reasons for radio listening. Morrison notes that Lazarsfeld's hectic data collection and lack of project completion began to worry Marshall in the Rockefeller office, who in 1939 consulted with Lynd about the situation. The latter suggested that a series of seminars be sponsored in which Lazarsfeld's "sailing orders" were to be more detailedly spelled out. The regular participants in this inter-disciplinary seminar between June 1939 and July 1940 included Charles Siepmann, Lyman Bryerson, Lloyd Free, Geoffrey Gorer, Donald Slesinger, Douglas Warples and Harold Lasswell. Morrison divulges that the second World War provided the focal point for the discussions and that it was in this context that Lasswell proposed his original formula which was to have such an impact on the organization of the new field. (Morrison, 1978:355-58)

In response to this pressure Lazarsfeld demonstrates what Winfrid Lerg calls his"superior tactical and publication strategies,"which helped him to consolidate his hold on the Radio project

and to take the next step in becoming the key figure in the mass media research field. The strategy foresaw both a big publishing "bang" and "legitimation" through the academy. The former was accomplished through two thematic issues in the Journal of Applied Psychology one appearing in February 1939 as "Radio Research" and the other in December 1940, entitled "Progress in Radio Research." Both issues brought together loosely related radio findings on program analysis research approaches and a report on the Lazarsfeld-Stanton Program Analyzer, which became a major industry polling device. (Lerg, 1977:76-77) "Legitimation" of the enterprise was gained through the wide-spread distribution of the eight seminar memoranda, including "Radio and the Printed Page" which was submitted by Lazarsfeld for the July 1939 meeting. These reports were distributed not only to the permanent seminar members, but an extremely large and distinguished number of academics drawn from a variety of disciplines. In short, Morrison notes, mass communications as a field of respectable study was at this point brought to the attention of the wider academic community. (Morrison, 1978:357)

The final step in laying claim to the new sub-specialty and thus to the work of the Princeton Radio Project and later Bureau, was to invent and "name" the new field. This occurred in conjunction with the 1944 publication of the third volume of Radio Research 1942-43 edited by Lazarsfeld and Stanton. It devotes a whole section to "daytime serials" (soap operas) and contains as well Leo Lowenthal's famous study of popular idols in magazine

fiction. Lerg notes that the inclusion of this article was justified by the editors with the interesting comment that "with time radio research will coalesce with magazine-, newspaper-, film- and television research into a new discipline, that of communications research." (Lerg, 1977:80) It was to these concerns that the Bureau directed its interests and energies right after World War II in its various election studies. These were completed in the early fifties after which Lazarsfeld drops communications to turn to more general questions of sociological method and theory.

By organizing an identifiable institutional entity, naming a new discipline and promoting its legitimation, Lazarsfeld can truly be said to be the "father" of a major area, mass media studies, if not of communication studies as a whole. The origins of the Bureau are important because they fostered cooperation between researchers from a variety of existing fields. Among these contributors, Harold Lasswell, the Chicago political scientist must be singled out, who created the agenda for the field with his "who says what to whom with what effect" formula. But it was Lazarsfeld who according to Shils extended the agenda in subsequent work with colleagues. Shils notes that he did this by asking why people attend to messages, that is, what gratifications, what rewards people get from the media and what functions the media serve in their lives. (Shils, 1979:414)

The Bureau is also important because it served as the locus for all of the background research leading to the "limited effects" model of the media which has dominated most North Ameri-

can communications research until the seventies. These include Lazarsfeld's work with Merton on Radio and Film Propaganda (1943); with Berelson and Gaudet on the People's Choice (1944, 1948, 1968) and with Katz on Personal Influence (1955). Klapper's The Effects of Mass Communication (1949, 1960); Wright's Mass Communication (1959, 1975); Berelson's Content Analysis in Communication Research (1952); and de Fleur's Theories of Mass Communication (1966, 1972, 1975) were all produced by personnel associated with the Bureau. (Rowland, 1983:64) It also popularized the work of Hoveland and Lewin who had their own institutes but whose research on persuasion and group behavior strengthened and substantiated the "limited effects" paradigm.

Yet, this paradigm is in fact flawed by the nature of its origins. Rowland makes a detailed and convincing argument that by the end of the forties, the intertwining with government and broadcasting interests began to subtly affect the Bureau's subsequent research. This intertwining occurred through the Office of War Information's "American Soldiers Studies", directed by Samuel Stouffer and participated in by Hoveland, Gallup, Cantril and others during the war years. Lazarsfeld and the Bureau worked closely with the WOI staff in designing the instruments for testing the morale-building films for soldiers and civilians, and in writing the analyses. At the same time he was also involved with Stanton in the development of radio listener polling techniques which not only proved that people liked what they got, but ultimately saved the industry from regulatory intrusion after the war.

Rowland concludes that the consequences of this association for the content of communications research are fairly clear. The key texts such as Merton's study of the Kate Smith war bond drive, his "Patterns of Influence" paper, and Lazarsfeld's analyses with others in the People's Choice and Personal Influence were based on perspectives reflecting government and military research needs during the war. They were based on conceptualizations which had to do with applied problems in influence and information, in the mechanics and enhancement of persuasive messages. These limited models were not designed to account for broader matters such as societal and cultural impact. (Rowland, 1983:80) And yet they were ultimately presented and interpreted as such.

III. Paradigm Challenges and New Technologies

The previous section has documented how the interweaving of client oriented (both government and media) research affected and subtly changed the "pure research" goals of Lazarsfeld's Bureau and through it, the ways of interpreting the findings which make up the "limited effects" paradigm. It also showed how government and media contracts provided not only financial security to the Bureau, but a supportive social environment for the validation of the growing social science research enterprise, which expanded dramatically after World War II. Daniel Bell attributes the growing optimism about the efficacy of the social sciences to a number of post-war developments. Among these are the introduction of the computer and statistical techniques, which permitted the framing

of social propositions in testable form. During the late forties and fifties, furthermore, U.S. universities increased in size through the GI Bill and Cold War scientific rivalry with the Soviet Union. This melded governmental and foundation resources into a huge development effort which included the social sciences. In the sixties, finally, the rediscovery of social problems like discrimination, poverty, race riots and environmental issues drew attention to the expertise of social scientists and gave them an identifiable role to play in the building of the great society. (Bell, 1982:12-21) Added to this there were the technological developments in cable and the linking of computers with broadcast capabilities resulting in the "information revolution."

Communication scholars, far from "withering away" as Berelson claimed in his 1959 evaluation of the Lazarsfeld era, were in fact turning out a "new breed of men" who were expanding the borders of the discipline. (Berelson, 1959:1-6) In Schramm's estimation this new breed of men were for the first time interested in mass media studies per se. They were traveling with their own disciplinary maps, and coming to stay at the oasis of communication studies. (Schramm, 1983:8) Though the history of this "third wave" still needs to be detailed and the role of Schramm in it needs to be evaluated, he fills in the broad outlines of the emerging picture. What happened in this period, with Schramm himself one of the chief architects of the new order, is that mass media studies, which in the work of the previous generation still had some tenuous socio-cultural connections, was now turned into

a communication "science", guided by the natural science metaphors of system theory and cybernetics.

In this third wave, the emphasis passed from disciplines to communication problems and universities began to create departments to deal with the related needs of training. Department restructuring resulted from two chief sources for in-migration into the field: skills departments such as journalism, speech, broadcasting, film and the like; and the so-called "practical communicators." Among these were advertising, marketing and public relations people. U.S. universities, especially in the Mid West "land grant" institutions, coped with these in-migrations not by amalgamation with existing departments. Instead, Schramm recalls, they opened the door to a possible new discipline, that of communication. Traditional journalism and speech departments regrouped into social science oriented communication departments and practically oriented journalism and/or speech departments.

Hand-in-hand with the restructuring of journalism departments went a change in curricula. Among the graduate courses offered there began to appear titles like "theory of communication", "effects of communication", "research methods in communication", indicating that research groups and programs began to develop. (Schramm, 1983:10) By the early fifties, seven Ph.D. programs were organized at the major Mid West universities. Four of these: Illinois (1949); Wisconsin (1950); Minnesota (1951); and Stanford (1952) were based on a behavioral approach to communication, while the other three: Iowa, Missouri and Syracuse focused more on

historical and legal approaches.

Exactly how this process of transformation was accomplished still remains to be chronicled for each of the major schools. (Thordahl, 1968:15-31) Beyond that, little information has yet been gathered to establish and trace the "family trees" of such second generation pioneers as Wilbur Schramm (Illinois), Ralph O. Nafziger (Wisconsin); Ralph Casey (Minnesota); Chilton Bush (Stanford); Raymond B. Nixon (Minnesota); and Fred S. Siebert (Illinois), who became heads of some of the transformed departments. Interestingly, all of these, except Schramm, had studied under Willard G. Bleyer, founder of journalism eduction at the University of Wisonsin in 1905. (Ross, 1957:470) Although his doctorate was in English Literature and Philosophy, he was a strong advocate of the need for social science training for journalists. No wonder that at least three of his students went to Washington during the war where they made the acquaintance of Lazarsfeld. (Nafziger, Casey, Bush)

Some of these men, ultimately transplanted Lazarsfeld's Bureau model to the academic scene, which was at this time even more open to enterpreneurship than it had been during Lazarsfeld's time. In the decade between 1946 and 1956 five such institutes were founded. Casey organized the Journalism Research Division in 1944 at Minnesota; Nafziger headed the Iowa Center for Audience Studies in 1946; Schramm became director of the Institute of Communication Research at Illinois in 1947 and later transferred to Stanford where he opened another in 1955. And in 1956 Michigan

State also began a Research Center.

These new institutes and departments saw their task as developing an "information science" by applying social and behavioral methods to practical communication problems. From such a perspective, personality, social system, and political aspects of behavior are only a secondary interest. What emerges is the association of science with the administration of publicity or information control, rather than with the communication processes operating within and between societies. Though greatly refined and systematized the major underlying perspective guiding the research of these third and fourth generation North American communication researchers is the "limited effects" model, initially presented by Lazarsfeld. In Gitlin's estimation this paradigm has some grave flaws:

> By its methodology, media sociology has highlighted the recalcitrance of audiences and their resistance to media messages. Yet it has looked to "effects" of broadcast programming in a specifically behaviorist fashion, defining "effects" so narrowly, microscopically, and directly as to make it very likely that survey studies could show only slight effects at most. It has enshrined short-run "effects" as "measures" of "importance" largely because these "effects" are measurable in a strict, replicable sense, thereby deflecting attention from larger social meanings of mass production. (Gitlin, 1978:206)

To this Rowland adds that a persistent, principal difficulty for this specific strain of research . . . is to develop the capacity to re-examine its origins and therefore to think more carefully about the assumptions guiding its definition of important problems in the relationships between the media and society. (Rowland, 1983:31)

In developing an intellectual history of a field, one must ask how and under what conditions the flaws in the received paradigm have been challenged. Interestingly these challenges appear in greater number during the seventies, often in conjunction with activism connected with the access movement which was trying to reform and "democratize" the media. (Rowland, 1983:30) Tracing these interrelationships in detail is beyond the scope of this paper except to note that two threads seem to motivate the challenges, an activist and a competitive one. Activists have organized around reform groups and challenged license applications before the FCC. A Cross-Atlantic competition seems to have developed between a number of rival schools giving the impression that "critical approaches" were imported from Europe especially Britain. (Rogers 1982, Blumler 1982) Though such an account makes the "ferment in the field" which the 1983 Journal of Communication volume specifically acknowledges, more interesting, it is probably overdrawn. Any assessment at present still suffers from one of history's oldest dilemmas, the clouded vision of the contemporary observer.

To avoid this dilemma, Karl Rosengren's excellent article in the same issue ignores the geographic attributes of the debate and concentrates on the philosophical bases from which the so-called "insurgent approaches" are made. The Burrell/Morgan four-fold typology distinguishes four paradigms: radical humanism; radical structuralism; interpretative sociology; and functionalism. (Burrell/Morgan, 1979) Rosengren demonstrates that such a typology is most useful as a springboard for reflections about the

type of research questions that can and cannot be answered within the different perspectives. Radical humanism encompasses the schools of critical theory and French existentialism. Radical structuralism harbors the schools of contemporary Mediterranean Marxism, conflict theory and Russian social theory. Interpretative sociology is composed of hermeneutics, phenomenological sociology, and phenomenology. While functionalist sociology is made up of interactionism, social action theory, integrative theory, social system theory and objectivism. (Rosengren, 1983:186-8)

Such a typology makes two important suggestions for the disciplinary historian: first, that challenges to the functionalist paradigm probably have precedents on both sides of the Atlantic; and second, that alternative perspectives must be sought in <u>each</u> of the historical periods. With respect to the first point, this paper has argued that the Chicago School provides such a precedent, and must be counted as the beginning of the discipline in the United States.

Even with only scanty material presently at hand, there is also evidence that only two kinds of challenges have occurred and re-occurred in North American communication studies. They come from the symbolic interactionist and the Marxist traditions. George H. Mead's symbolic theory mixed with the pragmatism of John Dewey created the Chicago School of interactionism in the twenties. This tradition re-awakens in the 1950's in the work of David Riesman, Kenneth Burke and Harold Innis. Of these James Carey says that they used scholarly methods different than those

dominating the social sciences of the day and were all touched by a relationship to American pragmatism and its sociological offshoot, symbolic interactionism. (Carey: 1983:312) Versions of symbolic interactionism are furthermore alive today, especially in the work of James Carey himself and in that of Horace Newcomb, to mention only the most visible writers. Carey first spelled out the differences between a "transmission" and a "ritual " view of communications in 1975, (Carey: 1975:3-8) while Horace Newcomb's Television the Critical View presents various symbolic approaches one year later. (1976)

A second consistent tradition offering a "critical approach" to U.S. communications studies, has been Marxism with its various variants. In its hermeneutic guise it challenged the 1930's era directly in the celebrated clash between Lazarsfeld and Adorno defending two approaches to research: the administrative and the critical. (Adorno: 1969 and Morrison, 1978:331-55) Marxism in its more classical political economy form, underlies the work of C. Wright Mills (Mills, 1959), Dallas Smythe (Smythe, 1967) and Herbert Schiller (Schiller, 1969) to name only a few writers in the sixties. In the seventies and eighties both the political economy and the Marxist humanist approaches experience a revival, possibly because of cross-fertilization with the British "cultural studies" approach practiced in Birmingham. (Hall, 1977 and 1980) Younger scholars working in this tradition are clustered around the Democratic Communication Movement. A final strand in the 1970's challenge is found in semiotic and phenomenological

perspectives, which have been primarily utilized in news analysis. As mentioned elsewhere, this tradition entered Great Britain through French structuralism and film theory and the United States via "cultural studies." (Robinson/Straw 1984) The phenomenological approaches in contrast, go back to Schütz and Germany, indicating that there are trans-Atlantic borrowings and transfers which must be given careful consideration in future work.

All of these "insurgent" groups, coming from different philosophical traditions are beginning to raise questions ignored by functionalism. They are exploring the corporate structure of the media and their regulatory setting. They are asking how broadcasting has changed the conduct of politics, religion and education through the transfer of power to journalistic elites. They are investigating how the various media discourses are structured by class and gender and how they affect common language. This questioning is motivated by a desire to understand how the public discourse creates and recreates not only the way in which a community talks <u>about</u> the world, but how it conceives of being <u>in</u> the world.

What of the future? Rosengren argues that since he has shown that the regulation/radical change dimensions of the four school typology does not build on different ontological and/or epistemological assumptions, and since empirical answers are often possible, our field may not have four different paradigms in the strong sense of the word, but only one. He therefore predicts a growing convergence of perspectives. (Rosengren, 1983:202-3) I myself

am not so certain, considering that communication studies are located at the confluence or juncture of the social and historical sciences and the questions raised by the "Positivismus Streit" are still unsettled.

Adorno, Theordore W. (1969). "Scientific Experience of a European Scholar in America, in D. Fleming and B. Bailyn (eds.), The Intellectual Migration: Europe to America, 1930-1960. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bell, Daniel (1982). The Social Sciences Since the Second World War. New Brunswick: Transaction Books.

Berelson, Bernard (1959). "The State of Communication Research," Public Opinion Quarterly 23:(Spring) 1-6.

Blumler, J.G. (1982). "Mass Communication Research in Europe: Some Origins and Prospects," in G.C. Wilhoit and H. De Bock (eds.), Mass Communication Review Yearbook, vol. 2. Beverly Hills: Sage, 37-49.

Brown, Roger (1970). "Approaches to the Historical Development of Mass Media Studies," in Jeremy Tunstall (ed.), Media Sociology. Urbana: University of Illincis Press.

Burrell, G. and G. Morgan (1979). Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis. London: Heinemann.

Carey, James (1975). "A Cultural Approach to Communication," Explorations in Communication 2:1, 1-23.

Carey, James (1983). "The Origins of the Radical Discourse on Cultural Studies in the United States," Journal of Communication 33:3, 311-64

Cartwright, Dorwin (1958). "Some Things Learned: An Evaluative History of the Research Center of Group Dynamics," Journal of Social Issues 12:1, 3-19.

de Fleur, Melvin and S. Ball-Rokeach (1975). Theories of Mass Communication. New York: McKay.

Gitlin, Todd (1978). "Media Sociology: The Dominant Paradigm," Theory and Society (November), 205-253.

Hall, Stuart (1977, 80). "Cultural Studies and the Centre: Some Problematics and Problems," in S. Hall, D. Hobson, A. Lowe, P. Willis (eds.), Culture, Media Language. London: Hutchison.

Hall, Stuart (1977, 80). "Recent Developments in Theories of Language and Ideology: A Critical Note," in S. Hall, D. Hobson, A. Lowe, P. Willis (eds.), Culture, Media Language. London: Hutchison.

Hardt, Hanno (1979). Social Theories of the Press: Early German and American Perspectives. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Hofstadter, Richard (1954). The Age of Reform. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Kuhn, Thomas S. (1970). The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2nd Edition.

Lasswell, Harold D. (1927). "The Theory of Political Propaganda," American Political Science Review 21:4, 627-.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F. (1969). "An Episode in the History of Social Research: A Memoir," in D. Fleming and B. Bailyn (eds.), The Intellectual Migration: Europe and America, 1930-1960. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Lerg, Winfrid (1977). "Paul Felix Lazarsfeld und die Kommunikations-Forschung. Ein bio-bibliographisches Epitaph." Publizistik 1, 72-87.

Lerner, Daniel (1979). "Harold D. Lasswell," in David Sills (ed.), International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, vol. 18, Biographic Supplement. New York: Free Press, 405-410.

Lewis, David L. and Richard Smith (1980). American Sociology and Pragmatism: Mead, Chicago Sociology and Symbolic Interaction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Matthews, Fred (1977). Quest for an American Sociology: Robert E. Park and the Chicago School. Montreal: McGill Queen's Press.

Mills, C. Wright (1959). The Sociological Imagination. New York: Oxford University Press.

Morrison, David E. (1978). "Kultur and Culture: The Case of Theodore W. Adorno and Paul F. Lazarsfeld," Social Research 45:2 (Summer), 331-355.

Morrison, David (1978). "The Beginning of Modern Mass Communication Research," European Journal of Sociology XIX, 347-359.

Newcomb, Horace (ed.) (1976). Television: The Critical View. London: Oxford University Press.

Park, Robert E. (1952). "Natural History of the Newspaper," in E. Hughes et al. (ed.), Human Communities: The City and Human Ecology. Glencoe: Free Press, 89-104.

Park, Robert E. (1952). "News as a Form of Knowledge," in Hughes E. et al. (eds.), Human Communities: The City and Human Ecology. Glencoe: Free Press, 71-88.

Park, Robert E. (1922). The Immigrant Press and its Control. New York: Harper and Bros.

Robinson, Gertrude J. and William Straw (1984). "Semiotics and Communication Studies: Points of Contact," in Melvin Voigt (ed.), Progress in Communication Studies, vol. 4. Norwood: Ablex Publ. Co., 45pp.

Rogers, Everett M. (1982). "The Empirical and Critical Schools of Communication Research," in M. Burgoon (ed.), Communications Yearbook, 5. New Brunswick: Transaction, 125-144.

Ross, Donald K. (1957). "Willard G. Bleyer and Journalism Education," Journalism Quarterly 34:3 (Fall), 466-74.

Rosengren, Karl Erik (1983). "Communication Research: One Paradigm or Four," Journal of Communication 33:3, 185-207.

Rowland, Willard (1983). The Politics of TV Violence: Policy Uses of Communications Research. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Schiller, Herbert (1969). Mass Communication and American Empire. New York: Augustus M. Kelley.

Schramm, Wilbur (1983). "The Unique Perspective of Communication: A Restrospective View," Journal of Communication 31:3 (Fall), 6-17.

Schudson, Michael (1978). Discovering the News: A Social History of American Newspapers. New York: Basic Books.

Smythe, Dallas (1967). The Structure and Policy of Electronic Communication. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Troldahl, Verling C. (1968). "Perspectives in Studying Communication." Unpublished manuscript, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1-37.

Tuchman, Gaye (1978). Making News: A Study in the Construction of Reality. New York: Free Press.